

Application No. 10/711,888  
Technology Center 1775  
Amendment dated January 24, 2007  
Reply to Office Action dated August 29, 2006

### REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-36 of the above-identified US Patent Application, with the result that claims 22-36 were withdrawn from consideration due to a restriction requirement, claim 7 was objected to, and claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, but otherwise deemed to recite allowable subject matter.

In response, Applicants have amended the claims as set forth above. More particularly:

Claims 22 through 36 have been canceled without prejudice in view of the restriction requirement.

For consistency with the specification, the remaining claims have been amended to substitute the terms "underlayer" and "overlayer" for "metallic coating" and "ceramic coating," respectively.

The pending claims have been further amended to recite the underlayer, metallic particles, matrix, and overlayer as having "compositions" to facilitate the recitation of certain limitations concerning the underlayer, metallic particles, matrix, and overlayer, and thereby address concerns for clarity that gave rise to §112 rejections of claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 13, 14, 16, and 19.

Independent claims 1 and 13 and dependent claims 3, 5, 14, 16 have been amended to adopt the form for Markush groups required by the

Application No. 10/711,888  
Technology Center 1775  
Amendment dated January 24, 2007  
Reply to Office Action dated August 29, 2006

Examiner.<sup>1</sup>

Dependent claim 2 has been amended to cancel the phrase "formed by interaction," which was the basis for a §112 rejection.

Dependent claims 4 and 15 have been amended to clarify that the underlayer, including the metallic particles and matrix that form the underlayer, are all substantially free of tin.

Dependent claim 6 has been amended to overcome the objection of claim 7, which depends therefrom. Support for this amendment can be found in [Para 16] (third line).

Dependent claims 10 and 20 have been amended to clarify that, in the embodiment covered by these claims, the underlayer and overlayer contact each other at a distinct interface, as represented in Figure 1.

Finally, dependent claim 12 has been amended to depend from claim 11, which provides antecedence for the term "metallic bond coat."

Applicants respectfully believe that the above amendments do not present new matter, and that these amendments overcome the claim objections and rejections. As such, Applicants respectfully request favorable

---

<sup>1</sup> MPEP §2173.05(h) states "*Ex parte Markush* sanctions claiming a genus expressed as a group consisting of certain specified materials." Accordingly, the operative phrase is "a group consisting of," not the words "chosen" or "selected."

Application No. 10/711,888  
Technology Center 1775  
Amendment dated January 24, 2007  
Reply to Office Action dated August 29, 2006

reconsideration and allowance of remaining claims 1-21.

Should the Examiner have any questions with respect to any matter now of record, Applicants' representative may be reached at (219) 462-4999.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Domenica N.S. Hartman  
Reg. No. 32,701

January 24, 2007  
Hartman & Hartman, P.C.  
Valparaiso, Indiana 46383  
TEL.: (219) 462-4999  
FAX: (219) 464-1166

Attachment: Petition for Extension of Time (two copies)